

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 2:24-cv-03261-SPG-SK

Date May 8, 2025

Title ALEXIS CERNAS ET AL. v. COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ET AL.

Present: The Honorable SHERILYN PEACE GARNETT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

P. Gomez

Not Reported

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

Not Present

Not Present

**Proceeding: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' UNOPPOSED
MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE OF COURT'S SCHEDULING DEADLINES
[ECF NO. 44]**

Before the Court is a Motion for Continuance of Court's Scheduling Deadlines (ECF No. 44 ("Motion")) filed by Defendants County of Los Angeles and Carlos Maciel ("Defendants"). Plaintiffs Alexis Cernas, Maritza Casillas, Beatriz Loera, and John I.C. and Jane I.C. Does, by and through their guardian *ad litem*, ("Plaintiffs") filed a Notice of Non-Opposition to the Motion (ECF No. 47 ("Non-Opp.")). The Court has read Defendants' submissions and concluded that the Motion is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 78(b); C.D. Cal. L.R. 7-15. Having considered the submissions, the relevant law, and the record in this case, the Court GRANTS the Motion.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16 authorizes courts to modify a pretrial and trial scheduling order "only for good cause." Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). "Good cause" exists when a deadline "cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension." *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992) (citation omitted). As relevant here, Defendants request an approximate 90-day continuance of all deadlines in this action. According to Defendants, at the end of March 2025, they retained new counsel in this matter. *See* (Mot. at 5). Thereafter, on April 1, 2025, the new defense counsel emailed Plaintiffs' counsel seeking a stipulation for a continuance of the pretrial and trial dates and requesting dates to schedule the depositions of Deputy Nathan Deboom and Deputy Christian Sanchez. *See* (*id.*). On April 7, 2025, defense counsel sent a follow up email to Plaintiffs' counsel. Plaintiffs' counsel allegedly did not respond to either of defense counsel's email correspondences. *See* (*id.*). Furthermore, during this time, the newly retained defense counsel also filed a notice of substitution of counsel, *see* (ECF No. 42), which the Court subsequently granted, *see* (ECF No. 45). In the meantime, defense counsel has also served Plaintiffs with deposition notices, and the parties are working through the logistics of scheduling the deputies' depositions. *See* (Mot. at 5–6); *see also* (Non-Opp. at 2).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 2:24-cv-03261-SPG-SK

Date May 8, 2025

Title ALEXIS CERNAS ET AL. v. COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ET AL.

Given the above facts, the Court finds that Defendants have shown good cause to modify the pretrial and trial scheduling order. Accordingly, the Court hereby GRANTS the Motion. The new pretrial and trial dates are as follows:

Event	Current Deadline	New Deadline
Fact Discovery Cut-Off	May 14, 2025	August 13, 2025
Initial Expert Disclosures	May 28, 2025	August 27, 2025
MSJ Filing	June 10, 2025	September 10, 2025
Rebuttal Expert Disclosures	June 18, 2025	September 17, 2025
Expert Discovery Cut-Off	July 2, 2025	September 30, 2025
MSJ Hearing	July 9, 2025	October 8, 2025
Settlement Conference	August 27, 2025	August 27, 2025 ¹
Trial Filings (first round)	September 3, 2025	December 3, 2025
Trial Filings (second round)	September 17, 2025	December 17, 2025
Final Pretrial Conference	October 1, 2025	January 7, 2026 at 3:00 PM
Trial	October 20, 2025	January 27, 2026 at 8:30 AM

Initials of Preparer pg _____

¹ Defendants do not request a continuance of the settlement conference original deadline.